DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 154 CE 031 913

AUTHOR	Campbell, Robert E.; And Others
TITLE	A Status Report of Follow-Through Services for Disadvantaged Vocational Students.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Mar 81
CONTRACT	300-78-0032
NOTE	26p.; For a related document see CE 031 914.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Vocational Education; Career Counseling; Career Planning; Disadvantaged; Educational Research; *Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Placement; Job Search Methods; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; *Referral; Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Follow Through Services

ABSTRACT

An investigation focused on determining whether additional services should be provided to Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program terminees to help them find and retain employment. It was illustrated that follow-through services were needed to help the significant number of CETA terminees who do not become employed after their departure from the program. By means of consultation with national experts and a wide range of CETA personnel, and a literature review, it was determined that follow-through services were extremely rare, and, where they did exist, delivery was unsystematic and limited. CETA staff attributed their absence to insufficient federal and state leadership, absence of specific funding, and lack of acknowledgement of programs providing such services. They supported the concept almost unanimously. Arguments for follow-through services included job placement assistance, further education and training for career development, strengthening of self-esteem, and reversal of long-term employability problems. Advantages for programs were protection of training investment, fewer program repeaters, feedback for program improvement, and improved program image and credibility. Arguments against services included lack of central administrative impetus, fostering of client dependency, and implication of program failure. (Twelve recommendations for promoting and improving delivery of follow-through services are made.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215154

A STATUS REPORT OF FOLLOW-THROUGH SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

Robert E. Campbell
Claire Ho
Catherine C. King-Fitch

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

March 1981

CE 031 913

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Pfister

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Applied Research and Development Function
Contract Number:	300780032
Project Number:	051MH10012
Educational Act Under Which the Funds Were Administered:	Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482
Source of Contract:	U.S. Department of Education Office of Vocational and Adult Education Washington, D.C.
Contractor:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210
Executive Director:	Robert E. Taylor
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the beneifts of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education Project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	viii
THE PROBLEM	1
THE ISSUE	5
AN ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUE AND METHODOLOGY	6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12
REFERENCES	15

FOREWORD

The goal of employment and training programs is to enable participants to become self-sufficient in the labor market by providing them with job training and employment opportunities. It has been found, however, that this goal is often not achieved. Each year thousands of former employemnt and training program participants fail to obtain jobs, and as a result, enter other training programs for career advancement. Considering the prodigious amount of time, money, and energy invested in training program participants for employment, follow-through services have been widely advocated as a means of protecting this investment by helping former participants secure and retain employment.

This report presents the findings of a study that identified the degree to which employment and training programs provide follow-through services and the current barriers and facilitators to the delivery of these services. The study addressed the questions of whether these programs should provide follow-through services, and if so, how should they be provided. Since the bulk of the employment and training programs are supported by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, 1973 (CETA), the study focused on CETA programs. Two important findings were uncovered in this study. First, although programs overwhelmingly support the idea of follow-through services, such services are rarely

implemented in practice, and second, no model exists to guide programs in delivering the services. In response to the need for a model for follow-through services, a companion report, Follow-Through Services: A Missing Link to the Employment of Disadvantaged Vocational Students, published by The National Center offers a model which consists of guidelines and strategies for implmenting these aspects of follow-through: client needs assessment, delivery of services, program evaluation for planning, and staffing requirement. The services described in the model include job search assistance, job adjustment counseling, career planning and training assistance, and referral to support services. The information contained in the model should be of use to program operators and staff who are seeking direction in implementing new follow-through services or expanding upon established ones.

Dr. Robert E. Campbell directed the project. Claire Ho, Program Associate, and Kenneth Shellberg, Graduate Research Associate, assisted in the conceptualization and development of the report. Special recognition is extended to Catherine King-Fitch, Program Associate, for the writing of significant sections and editing of the report.

Appreciation is extended to project consultants, members of the advisory panel, and the external reviewers of the report as follows:

S. Justine Suafai
Women in Apprenticeship Program
San Francisco, California

Dr. Charles F. Nichols
Minneapolis Public Schools
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dr. Felix R. Sloan
Detroit Public Schools
Cetroit, Michigan

Jeanne McGuire
CETA Outplacement Unit
Boston, Massachusetts

Carlos Gonzales
Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Barbara Moody
Maricopa Employment and
Training Administration
Phoenix, Arizona

Dr. James Wall
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi

Fred Wentzel
National Alliance of Businesses
Washington, D.C.

Gale L. Zahniser
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Lastly, this report could not have been produced without the typing assistance of Nancy Robinson, Mary Naille, and Beverly Haynes.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

One of the greatest problems facing this nation in recent years has been unemployment. Ranging from 4.9 to 7.8 percent since 1970 for the general population, unemployment has been felt even more acutely by the disadvantaged. Estimates of unemployment among black teenagers, for example, have ranged from 40 to 50 percent. The federal government's major initiative against this problem in the last decade has been the CETA employment and training programs, which prepare economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons for work. Many CETA participants, however, do not obtain or retain employment after their training ends. This has been attributed to problems related to economic conditions, job search, job adjustment, career planning and progression, and personal problems affecting employment.

This report examines whether additional services should be provided to CETA clients after they leave the training programs to help them find and retain employment. Termed "follow-through services," these services might include job search assistance, job adjustment counseling, career planning and training assistance, and referral to community service agencies.

A study was conducted to identify the current status of follow-through services, the need for such services, facilitators of and barriers to their provision, and recommended strategies for delivering the services. By means of consultation with national experts and a wide range of CETA personnel, as well as a review of the literature, the following determination was made:

1. Follow-through services are extremely rare, and, where they do exist, their delivery is unsystematic and limited in scope and duration.
2. CETA staff attribute the absence of follow-through services to insufficient federal and state leadership, absence of specific funding, and the lack of acknowledgement of the programs providing such services. Follow-through services would have to be provided at the expense of other services, such as training, which would be perceived as weakening present programs.
3. CETA staff support the concept of follow-through services almost unanimously.

The information gained in the study further yielded a number of arguments for and against the provision of follow-through services. The majority of those arguments relate to the benefits derived from follow-through services. For example, their potential for helping jobless clients find work, obtain further education and training for career development, strengthen self-esteem, and reverse long-term employability problems are benefits expected to be derived by the clients. In addition to potential societal benefits, advantages for the programs include protection of the training investment, reduction in the numbers of program repeaters, provision of feedback for program improvement, and improvement in the image and credibility of CETA programs.

Arguments against follow-through services, voiced by only a few and considered to be debatable, include the fear that lack of central administrative impetus could make it difficult and costly

to implement such services, that the services would foster client dependency, and that the existence of follow-through services would imply failure by the CETA employment and training programs in making their clients employable.

The preponderance and credibility of the arguments for follow-through services, and the debatability and limitations of those against, support the conclusion that follow-through services would be an important extension of the employment and training programs and should be provided.

Recommendations for promoting and improving the delivery of follow-through services include the following:

1. Incorporation of follow-through services as an integral part of all employment and training programs
2. Increased federal support to CETA prime sponsors for providing follow-through services, including demonstration funds, technical assistance, and incentives
3. Development and field testing a model for follow-through services to guide local programs in the design and implementation of such services, and the availability of a national resource for assisting programs in implementing the model
4. Utilization of follow-through services staff as a source of program evaluation information relating to both the employment and training and the follow-through phases of service delivery
5. Experimentation with a variety of cost effective techniques for service delivery
6. Establishment of mechanisms for the exchange of ideas for

implementing and improving follow-through services

7. Strengthening of linkages between employment and training programs, educational institutions, and community organizations
8. Inclusion of the concepts and techniques of follow-through services in the curricula of teacher and counselor education programs
9. The undertaking of research studies examining (a) differential effects on clients receiving follow-through services versus those not receiving such services, (b) personal support systems for the disadvantaged and how they can be utilized more effectively in follow-through, (c) factors that account for the differences between successful and unsuccessful disadvantaged program participants, and (d) factors in employment settings that inhibit or enhance the career progression of disadvantaged program completers

THE PROBLEM

Unemployment: A National Problem

Unemployment has been a major problem for the past several decades. When a large segment of a nation's population is unemployed, the nation loses resources, productivity, and much of its potential for economic and social growth. On a personal level, those who do not participate in America's work force are prevented from obtaining the material, psychological, and social advantages that work affords. Because of the far-reaching effects of unemployment on the nation as a whole and on the personal lives of the unemployed, the problem of unemployment and the strategies for reducing it have influenced and will continue to influence national policy related to the economy, education, and human resources.

The severity of the problem is reflected in the unemployment figures since 1970. Since that year, the unemployment rate has not fallen below 4.9 percent (Current Statistics June 1980). The unemployment rate for 1980 hit a high of 7.8 percent in July, with more than 8 million persons out of work (U.S. Department of Labor October 1980). The unemployment problem is one with which the nation will continually and tenaciously have to grapple.

The Impact on the Disadvantaged

Although people from all segments of America's population are among the unemployed, unemployment occurs in disproportionate numbers among the socioeconomically disadvantaged. Unemployed, disadvantaged persons include all races, sexes, and ages, but most often are youth, particularly blacks. Youth make up only one quarter of the labor force but account for half of the unemployed (Rosenberg 1980). Unemployment among black youth is even more severe: two out of every five black teenagers are without jobs. Some estimate unemployment among inner-city black teenagers to be at 50 percent (Taggart and Wurzburg 1978).

Disadvantaged persons, of whatever ethnic group, sex, or age, have been variously described (Oetting, Cole, Miller 1974; Goodwin 1977; Reubens 1977) as having--

- limited education;
- no marketable skills;
- poor motivation;
- negative attitudes toward work;
- low self-esteem;
- little knowledge of how to behave on the job;

- poor work habits;
- a history of problems in interpersonal relationships;
- personal problems;
- a hand-to-mouth existence.

These characteristics and conditions have made it difficult for disadvantaged persons to find and retain employment. Consequently, the federal government has forged major efforts to facilitate the incorporation of disadvantaged persons into the labor market by providing programs and services to overcome the barriers which impede their finding and retaining employment.

The Federal Response

The federal government's current major initiative for helping the disadvantaged become more employable has been the authorization of federally funded, locally controlled employment and training programs. The vast majority of these programs are sponsored through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973. The principal aim of this act is:

> To provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed and underemployed persons to enable them to secure self-sustaining, unsubsidized employment (Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979).

CETA programs are delivered by 460 prime sponsors, which are local, state, city, or county (or combinations of such governmental units) operations serving areas with populations of 100,000 or more. The prime sponsors arrange to provide classroom instruction, on-the-job training, work experience, public service employment, counseling, testing, job development, child-care, and other support services to disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed persons. Prime sponsors provide these services directly or through contracts with such organizations as state employment services, vocational education agencies, community groups, and private enterprises.

The primary emphasis of CETA employment and training programs is on skill development. Skill training averages six to twelve months in length and can be offered to participants for up to thirty months within a five-year period. CETA programs also provide support services to help participants remain enrolled in the programs. These services can be (but are not limited to) counseling, work orientation, job coaching, health care, child-care, and transportation. Prime sponsors can "devote as much or as little resources to supportive services as they deem appropriate" (Turner and Conradus 1978). In addition, CETA programs provide job placement assistance to participants

who are terminating their training. The effectiveness of the programs often is measured by the number of program completers who are placed in jobs. Follow-up status checks on terminees are made at thirty-, sixty-, and ninety-day intervals after they leave the programs.

Some Still Flounder

A significant number of CETA terminees (those who leave prematurely or who complete CETA programs) do not become employed after their departure from the program. Many who initially find employment do not retain it. Some hop from job to job. Others remain unemployed and reenter CETA programs or receive other forms of public assistance. In 1979, about 1.3 million persons left CETA programs. A third, or more than 400,000 persons, did not obtain jobs, return to school, or enter other training ("CETA Serves 4 Million" April 1980). A 1979 longitudinal follow-up survey, which examined the employment status of 11,000 terminees who entered CETA during fiscal year 1976, indicated that at no time within the twelve months after termination did the percentage of unemployed terminees fall below 20 percent, nor did the percentage of employed rise above 60 percent. The results of the survey are shown below (U.S. Department of Labor March 1979).

Posttermination Time Point	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the Labor Force
1 month	50%	28%	22%
3 months	53%	26%	21%
6 months	55%	24%	21%
9 months	58%	22%	20%
12 months	60%	21%	19%

These findings show that a significant number of persons who complete CETA training programs do not secure or retain employment. When CETA participants fail to secure or retain employment, the goal of CETA--to produce economically self-sustaining members of society--is not being met. Considering the resources expended on the training programs--9.4 billion dollars in fiscal year 1979 ("CETA Serves 4 Million" April 1980)--those who fail to become employed represent a substantial investment loss. This loss is not only monetary, but also represents lost time and effort of both training staff and participants. When program completers are not absorbed in the labor market, the effectiveness of the training program is proportionately reduced.

There appears to be no single, simple explanation to account for those who are unable to secure or retain employment. The causes are varied. They may be related to finding a job, adjusting to work, meeting the performance expectations of employers, solving personal problems that interfere with work, and planning for career progression. The following are examples of problems participants frequently face after terminating their programs.

Job Placement/Acquisition Problems--

- Failure to secure employment
- Dissatisfaction with present employment
- Inadequate job search skills
- Lack of knowledge about the labor market

Job Adjustment Problems--

- Inability to cope with problems and tensions of the job
- Failure to learn and abide by the organization's written and unwritten rules
- Inability to accept criticism and supervision
- Inability to produce sufficient amount or acceptable quality of work
- Failure to get along with coworkers

Personal Problems that Affect Job Performance--

- Inadequate transportation
- Inadequate child-care
- Physical health problems
- Mental health problems
- Financial problems

Career Planning and Progression Problems--

- Dissatisfaction with level of employment
- Lack of knowledge about advancement
- No career direction
- Career stagnation (dead-end jobs, absence of career ladders)
- Insufficient information/resource to achieve career goals

THE ISSUE

These examples help to illustrate the larger problem: that there is a need for additional client services beyond program termination that will strengthen employability and facilitate career progression. Follow-through services such as job search assistance, job adjustment counseling, career planning and training assistance, and referral to community service agencies have been advocated to meet this need. At the present time, however, it is extremely rare to find programs offering follow-through services to their former participants.

The issue raised in this report is: Should follow-through services be provided to former participants of employment and training programs to help them secure and retain employment and to facilitate their career progression?

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUE AND METHODOLOGY

Information relevant to whether follow-through services should be provided was obtained from a study assessing the current status of follow-through services provided to disadvantaged and nontraditional graduates* of employment and training programs (Campbell, Ho, King-Fitch, and Shellberg 1981). Since services to this client population are offered predominantly through CETA, CETA programs received major emphasis. The study sought to answer the following questions: (1) To what extent do employment and training programs provide follow-through services? (2) What facilitators and barriers to the provision of follow-through services currently exist? (3) Should follow-through services be provided? (4) If follow-through services should be provided, how should they be delivered?

Methodology

The study was conducted by obtaining information through four major sources: (1) consultation with a national panel of experts, (2) a literature review, (3) telephone interviews, (4) program visits.

A national panel of experts served as advisors to the study. They were selected on the basis of their expertise, employment and training, the diversity of programs they represented, and their interest in follow-through services for the disadvantaged.

The professional literature relating to follow-through was reviewed to obtain information on such topics as employment and training programs, job placement and follow-up, career development and guidance, job adjustment, special problems of the disadvantaged and nontraditional students, and job counseling and support services.

The staff members of sixty-five CETA programs were interviewed by telephone to determine actual delivery of or interest in follow-through services and receptivity to visits by project staff. The programs were selected for their apparent interest in follow-through services as suggested by their program descriptions, and for their diversity of programs, populations, and geographic regions. These programs represented approximately 14 percent of all CETA prime sponsors, were distributed throughout all ten Department of Labor regions, and represented both large and small cities in thirty states.

---

*Nontraditional graduates are those who have completed vocational programs nontraditional for their sex.

Ten CETA programs, located in eight states representing the eastern, midwestern, southwestern, and western regions of the country were visited. They were selected according to the degree to which they delivered or advocated follow-up services, their receptivity to visits, and diversity of programs. Approximately 100 CETA staff (administrators, vocational educators, counselors, instructors, and placement officers) and students were interviewed to obtain information on the following topics: (1) program goals, services, target population, and the extent of follow-through services, (2) recommended services for inclusion in a follow-through program and methods for delivering such services, (3) barriers to and facilitators for delivering follow-through services, (4) staff competencies needed for delivering the services, (5) recommendations for improving service delivery, and (6) suggestions for further research concerning follow-through.

The information from these sources provided a number of observations relative to the current status and future potential of follow-through services for the disadvantaged.

Current Status of Follow-Through Services

Very few programs currently provide follow-through services. Of the sixty-five programs contacted, less than 5 percent have such services. In the few programs where follow-through services are provided, delivery is not systematic and the services are extremely limited in scope and duration. For the most part, these services consist of support groups for women in programs nontraditional for their sex.

CETA staff attribute the absence of follow-through services to several factors: (1) insufficient leadership at the federal and state level, (2) the absence of funding for providing follow-through services, and (3) the lack of credit for providing these services. While the CETA legislation allows for the provision of follow-through services up to ninety days after student program completion, it neither mandates delivery of such services nor provides guidelines for their design and implementation. As a result, local programs that conduct follow-through activities do so of their own volition, in isolation, and usually by trial and error. Programs that want to initiate follow-through services or improve their present ones have few available resources--such as guidelines, technical assistance, or even administrative directives--to do so. Although programs have the option of providing follow-through services, they must do so at the cost of diverting funds from other services. Therefore, using funds to provide follow-through services to former participants decreases the funds available for services to current participants. Programs are reluctant to use part of their funding for follow-through because they feel it will weaken established training programs. Under the current system, program success is measured and rewarded

primarily on the basis of job placement rates at program termination. Little emphasis is placed on client benefits achieved through follow-through services (job retention, job adjustment and satisfaction, long-term career stability and progression, and so on). As a result, programs focus their time and energy on "in-training" activities that will lead to immediate placement rather than on follow-through services aimed at long-range job stability and career progression.

Although little evidence of existing follow-through programs was found, there is virtually unanimous support of the concept of follow-through services among the CETA programs contacted and the panel of advisors. Total opposition is very rare. An overwhelming majority of program personnel advocate follow-through services because of the benefits they feel would be derived by the clients, by the staff, and by the programs themselves. They report that they presently have no way of knowing how well many of their clients fare in the labor market after they leave the program. While follow-up checks are used to ascertain employment status, these checks are not used to address client problems (such as job adjustment, job satisfaction, or need for additional career counseling and other supportive services).

Program personnel feel that given sufficient funds, follow-through services could be implemented by building onto the existing follow-up mechanisms. Most CETA programs are currently conducting follow-up status checks of their clients at thirty-, sixty-, and ninety-day intervals. These check points can serve as mechanisms upon which to build a cost efficient follow-through program. During follow-up checks, clients' progress can be assessed, present or potential problems can be identified, and clients can be informed of available follow-through services. Use of existing check points would reduce the amount of extra time, effort, and paper work that would be needed to implement a follow-through program.

Arguments for and Against Providing Follow-Through Services

Since follow-through services are rarely implemented, no formal evaluation data are available as to their effectiveness. However, in the course of conducting this study, a number of arguments both for and against such services were voiced by the panel, in the literature, and by the CETA staff members who were interviewed. The following is a summary of those arguments. It must be remembered that the arguments are based on perceptions of the <u>projected</u> need and <u>potential</u> impact of such services, rather than on experience gained through the actual implementation of a follow-through services program.

Arguments for Follow-Through Services

Continued job placement assistance can help jobless clients. Program terminees who do not find employment or who do become employed and then quit or lose their jobs can benefit from follow-through placement assistance. The service can be useful in helping clients identify job opportunities and instructing them on job seeking skills, which wolud increase their potential for stable employment.

Follow-through services can help clients obtain further education and training for career development. Some clients who complete training and obtain employment want to advance in their careers, either within their current jobs or through other job opportunities. Frequently, further education or training provides the means for career progression. A follow-through service program can help clients to identify education and training opportunities that will help them achieve their career goals.

Follow-through services can help clients strengthen their self-esteem. By helping clients to obtain, adjust to, and retain employment, and thus to become established in the labor market, follow-through services can contribute to the development and strengthening of clients' self-esteem. This stronger sense of self-worth may lead to their becoming even more stable, productive, and satisfied members of the work force.

Follow-through services can aid in reversing clients' long-term problems. Often the characteristics that impede a client's ability to obtain and retain employment cannot be reversed in the short time period during which training takes place. Longer-term intervention than is provided in employment and training programs may be needed to help resolve such problems. Follow-through services have the potential for helping clients over an extended period of time to improve their long-term employability and career progression.

Follow-through services can help to protect the training investment. Employment and training programs are expensive. Although there are no official figures, local programs unofficially estimate that annual costs per participant range from $500 to $10,000 depending on the size and kind of program, length of participation by the client, the services provided, and so on. This investment in training is lost when program completers fail to secure and retain employment. Follow-through services are expected to increase the probability of job acquisition, retention, and progression, and, in turn, to protect the monies that have been invested in training.

Follow-through services can help to reduce program repeaters. CETA program operators have found that many clients complete training only to reenter the programs and receive more training. Some clients do this repeatedly (the term "CETA junkie" has been used to describe these "recycled" participants). Many reasons have been advanced to explain this phenomenon: fear of trying to survive in a competitive work environment, poor attitudes toward work, inability to find employment, inability to cope with job stress, and so on. Undoubtedly, the reasons differ from one person to another, and many or all may apply to a given individual. Many problems such as these can be averted or resolved by providing timely post-program assistance. Follow-through services, such as job search assistance, work orientation, job adjustment counseling, and similar services help to provide the transition from training to stable employment rather than to repeated training.

Follow-through services can provide valuable feedback for program improvement. Staff members who provide follow-through services are in a unique position to observe the outcomes of employment and training programs and related services. Their direct interaction with clients and employers in the labor market provides a view of how successfully the training mission is being accomplished. By observing the degree to which clients--and, in turn, programs--have met their goals, follow-through service staff can provide evaluative feedback to the various program components. Such information can be used in the analysis and improvement of services, including not only those within the training programs, but those in the follow-through programs as well.

Follow-through services can improve the image and credibility of CETA programs. When employers, former and current participants, and members of the community observe that programs are concerned with the posttraining needs of participants, then the image of those programs may be enhanced. Follow-through services demonstrate a commitment to helping clients become established, productive, and satisfied members of the work force. This kind of commitment supports and strengthens the image of employment and training programs as contributing to the well-being of the workers, the employers, and the community at large.

Follow-through services can help to produce societal benefits. To the extent that follow-through services help clients become estalbished and stabilized in the labor market, society gains in a number of ways. Psychologically, society gains through the knowledge that the clients have become taxpayers, not tax users, and that they are contributing to the nation's productivity, not draining it of its resources. Economically, society benefits from the reduction of transfer payments and the increase in collected taxes, consumer spending and national output.

Arguments Against Follow-Through Services

There is no central administrative impetus encouraging the implementation of follow-through services. Presently there is no leadership at the federal or state level directing or assisting programs in the delivery of follow-through services. While the CETA legislation allows for the provision of follow-through services, it neither mandates delivery of such services nor provides standards or guidelines for their design and implementation. Therefore, programs that do conduct follow-through activities do so of their own volition, in isolation, and usually by trial and error. Unless such leadership is provided, establishing follow-through programs could be costly in terms of effort required to produce quality programs.

Follow-through services would foster client dependency. Although the prevailing attitudes of those contacted were generally positive, some staff fear that providing follow-through services as being a means by which former clients would remain attached to the training program rather than as a support mechanism for facilitating clients' achievement of self-sufficiency. Based upon a belief that clients who know that help is available beyond program termination will unendingly take advantage of that help, they foresee follow-through services defeating the program objective of making clients employable and self-sufficient in the labor market.

The existence of follow-through services would imply program failure. A small number of program personnel also feel that the provision of follow-through services would reflect negatively on the performance of the training programs. That is, the need for follow-through services might be seen as an indication that programs are failing in their training goal: that of making their clients employable.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In examining the arguments for and against the delivery of follow-through services, it appears that the arguments in favor of providing the services far outweigh those against providing them. The arguments for follow-through services numbered more than those against and were endorsed by an overwhelming majority of programs. The proponents expressed their support of the services with resounding enthusiasm that reflects a strong belief in their potential benefits to both programs and clients.

Follow-through services were seen to benefit programs primarily by helping them achieve their major goal: that of making their clients more competitive and employable in the labor market. Because the actual implementation of follow-through services is rare, it is difficult to predetermine whether the benefits from the services can be realized. However, if they can be realized, then the problems related to unemployment (e.g., loss in national productivity, continued outlays for income transfer payments, and subsidized employment) might well be reduced. Considering the severity of these problems and the potential for follow-through services to relieve them, the arguments in favor of services seem more compelling than those against.

The arguments against follow-through services are legitimate but they are not convincing enough to rule out providing the services. For example, the argument that follow-through services foster client dependency is debatable. Programs can minimize client dependence on follow-through services. Although some client dependency always will exist in any program, its extent can be controlled through program design. Services should be designed to minimize client dependency and eventually foster independence, e.g., teach job search skills rather than find jobs for clients. Dependency can be further reduced through techniques such as establishing predetermined time limits for services, encouraging self-growth, and limiting the services to only those in dire need. Clients with severe problems consuming an inordinate amount of staff time could be referred to community agencies.

The argument that follow-through services could reflect negatively on the programs by implying that the programs are failing at their training function is also debatable. It can be shown that programs are only carrying out their normal duties by delivering follow-through services because many client problems related to employability (such as job adjustment) do not surface until after program termination. By helping their clients beyond termination, programs can demonstrate that they are truly committed to improving their clients'

chances of succeeding in the labor market. Also, in resolving some clients' posttermination problems through follow-through services, the incidence of program repeaters may be reduced. This phenomenon would likewise enhance the programs' image rather than detract from it.

In summary, the arguments in favor of follow-through services are stronger and less controversial than those against having services. Therefore, this paper supports the delivery of such services. The following recommendations are made for promoting and improving the delivery of the services and for developing research and development activities to examine the services' effectiveness.

Summary of Recommendations

1. Follow-through services should be incorporated as an integral part of all employment and training programs to enhance job retention and career progression. Follow-through should be viewed as a significant phase of the developmental process in assisting persons to progress from a state of unemployment to a state of self-sufficiency.

2. CETA prime sponsors should be given more federal support in their efforts to provide follow-through services through (a) availability of demonstration funds, (b) provision of technical assistance for implementing services, and (c) incentives to foster their implementation.

3. Because it was found, in the course of this study, that no model exists to guide programs in delivering follow-through services, a follow-through model should be (a) developed to facilitate programs in the design and implementation of such services, (b) field-tested with different types of employment and training programs to assess its operational utility in terms of program variations, and (c) conducted by those who would serve as a national resource for assisting other programs in delivering the services.

4. Because follow-through staff members are in a unique position to observe the program participants' status and progress beyond training, they should be utilized as a key source for providing program evaluation information. Such information should address both the employment and training phase and the follow-through phase of service delivery.

5. Employment and training programs should experiment with a variety of follow-through techniques to improve cost effectiveness--for example, reducing costs by using group instead of individual counseling where feasible.

6. Mechanisms should be established for the exchange of ideas for implementing and improving follow-through services. For example, national and regional conferences, hotlines, networks, or other strategies might be used.

7. To enhance delivery of follow-through services, employment and training programs should continue to strengthen their linkages with educational institutions--such as community colleges, technical schools, apprenticeship programs, and universities--and with community organizations that provide support services.

8. Teacher and counselor educators should be encouraged to include the concepts and techniques of follow-through within their curricula.

9. A comparative longitudinal study should be undertaken to study the differential effects upon those clients receiving follow-through services versus those who have not recieved such services.

10. Personal support systems appear to be critical to successful job adjustment and stability. Research should be conducted on the variations of support systems for the disadvantaged and how they can be utilized more effectively in follow-through.

11. Research should be conducted to identify and examine the factors that account for the differences between successful and unsuccessful disadvantaged vocational graduates of CETA programs in personal support systems, self-esteem, job survival skills, type and quality of training, sense of agency/unity, and availability of follow-through services.

12. A study should be conducted to examine the factors in employment settings that inhibit or enhance the career progession of disadvantaged vocational graduates of CETA programs.

REFERENCES

Campbell, R.E.; Ho, C.; King-Fitch, C.; and Shellberg, K. Follow-Through Services: A Missing Link to Employment for the Disadvantaged. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1981.

"CETA Serves 4 Million in FY 1979." ETA Interchange. 6(April, 1980): 8.

Employment and Training Report of the President. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Goodwin, L. What has been Learned from the Work Incentive Program and Related Experiences: A Review of Research with Policy Implications. Worcester, Massachusetts: Worcester Polytechnic Institute, February 1977.

Oetting, E.K.; Cole, C.W.; and Miller, C.D. Stages of Work Adjustment and the Disadvantaged, Volume II. Fort Collins CO: Colorado State University, December 1974.

Reubens, B. Bridges to Work: International Comparisons of Transition Services. Conservation of Human Resources Series 3. New York: University Books, 1977.

Rosenberg, J. "New Youth Program Aims are Set." ETA Interchange 6(April, 1980): 4.

Taggart, R., and Wurzburg, G. "Opportunities for Vocational Education in Youth Employment Training Programs." Youth Unemployment: Solving the Problem. Arlington, VA: The American Vocational Association, 1978.

Turner, S., and Conradus, C. Supportive Services: CETA Program Models. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

U.S. Department of Labor. Employment and Earnings. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey. Report MEL 79-06. Contract No. 23-24-75-07. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1979.